



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mm  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,813	09/18/2003	John Hans Handy Bosma	AUS920030620US1	8947
45371	7590	04/10/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION (RUS) c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLP 2100 Ross Avenue Suite 2600 DALLAS, TX 75201			TO, BAOTRAN N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2135		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/10/2007	PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/666,813	HANDY BOSMA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Baotran N. To	2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/18/2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-18,20-28 and 29-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/18/03.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-37 are pending in the application.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 09/18/2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

- 3.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 27-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 27 recites "instructions comprising: a security table having a plurality of access rights; a security program; a simultaneous approval program; and an access approval program" in lines 3-7. It is unclear that the applicants want to claim the instructions comprise the programs. Since a computer program is merely a set of instruction capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process. Therefore, Claim 27 is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 28-37 are also rejected because of dependency.

***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 1, 4-6, 13, 14, 17-19, 26, 28-29, 37 are objected to because of the following informalities: "allowing" words. It is unclear what applicant's intend metes and bounds of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-27, and 29-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao (U.S. Patent 6,035,404) hereinafter Zhao in view of Gupta (U.S. Patent 6,516,315 B1) hereinafter Gupta.

7.

Regarding Claims 1 and 14, Zhao discloses a method for limiting the users on a computer network comprising:

determining if both a manager and an employee, each having an equal access right, are logged in (col. 6, lines 19-53);

responsive to a determination that both the manager and the employee are logged in, allowing access to a high security application (col. 6, lines 19-53); and

terminating the access to the high security application when either the manager or the employee logs out (col. 7, lines 2-10).

Zhao does not disclose creating a security table having a plurality of access rights.

However, Gupta disclose creating a security table having a plurality of access rights (Figure 5, col. 3, lines 35-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Gupta's reference with Zhao to include creating a security table having a plurality of access rights. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it would provide access control of information on a computer system (Gupta, col. 2, lines 28-30).

Regarding Claim 27, Zhao discloses a program product operable on a computer, the program product comprising:

a computer-readable medium (col. 1, lines 17-20);

wherein the computer readable medium comprises instructions comprising:

a security program (col. 1, lines 65-67);

a simultaneous approval program (col. 7, lines 15-25); and

an access approval program (col. 5, lines 55-61).

Zhao does not disclose a security table having a plurality of access rights.

However, Gupta disclose a security table having a plurality of access rights (Figure 5, col. 3, lines 35-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Gupta's reference with Zhao to include a

security table having a plurality of access rights. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it would provide access control of information on a computer system (Gupta, col. 2, lines 28-30).

Regarding Claims 2 and 15, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses accepting an employee login; and determining the employee's security clearance (col. 5, lines 55-61).

Regarding Claims 3 and 16, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses accepting a manager login; and determining the manager's security clearance (col. 5, lines 55-61).

Regarding Claims 4, 17, and 29, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses wherein the allowing access to the high security application step comprises:

accepting an access request for the high security application by the employee (col. 2, lines 40-45);

allowing review of the access request by the manager (col. 2, lines 28-45); and determining if the manager approved the access request (col. 6, lines 8-15); responsive to a determination that the manager approved the access request, allowing the employee to access the high security application (col. 8, lines 10-20); and

responsive to a determination that the manager did not approve the modification, not allowing the employee to access the high security application (col. 2, lines 28-45).

Regarding Claims 5 and 18, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses responsive to a determination that both the manager and the employee are logged in, allowing modification of a high security application (col. 2, lines 28-45).

Regarding Claims 7, 20, and 30, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses wherein the employee accesses the high security application and the manager monitors the employee's access (col. 6, lines 10-15).

Regarding Claims 8, 21, and 31, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses wherein the monitoring comprises: review by the manager of a history log of the employee's access and modifications (col. 6, lines 10-15).

Regarding Claims 9, 22, and 32, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses wherein the monitoring comprises: viewing the employee's screen (col. 6, lines 10-15).

Regarding Claims 10, 23, and 33, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses wherein the manager accesses the high security application and the employee cannot monitor the manager's access (col. 2, lines 10-15).

Regarding Claims 11, 24, and 35, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses wherein the terminating the access to the high security application step comprises: closing the high security application immediately upon logout by either the manager or the employee (col. 7, 55-61).

Regarding Claims 12, 15, and 36, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses wherein the terminating the access to the high security application step comprises: terminating only the right to modify and not the right to access the high security application (col. 7, 55-61).

Regarding Claims 13, 26, and 37, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses wherein the terminating the access to the high security application step comprises: not allowing a manager or an employee to re-open the high security application after the manager or employee closes the high security application (col. 7, lines 55-66).

Regarding Claim 34, Zhao and Gupta disclose the limitation of Claims 1, 14, and 27 above. Zhao further discloses instructions for terminating the access to the high security application when either the manager or the employee logs out (col. 7, lines 2-10).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 6, 19, and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Contact Information***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baotran N. To whose telephone number is 571-272-8156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

04/02/2007



HOSUK SONG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER